

in another place, where he was a member of a
several companies, and he was married with
a woman whose husband had no longer his pos-
session. You'll perceive, as a result of having received
the information, that the man who had the
woman in his power, did not care that she left him,
as he had no right to her, by the common law.
But such is not the case with us. I
consequently, I have concluded, that the woman has
a right to remain, as she will be more comfortable under
the roof of my house than she will be with the other persons
with whom she now resides, and, as far as I can see, she
was compelled to go from me, because, and merely, in
order to get rid of me.

Lastly, the Saviour came "to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." Here too, the language is so plain and the reference is so plain, that no honest mind can mistake it, for in every reference Bible you will find in the margin that for the "acceptable year" we are referred to the tenth verse of the twenty-fifth chapter of Leviticus, "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." This, you know, was the celebrated year of jubilee, which occurred every forty-ninth year; and had we as a nation obeyed this clause, this express command, the days of slavery would have long ago numbered. This command, then, which had been neglected, and which, as expressed in this verse, our Saviour came to reinforce, is so clear as to need no comment. I therefore leave off at I began, and ask you with all seriousness and seriousness, when you consider the remarkable fact that this text of all others from Genesis to Malachi was the one chosen by our Saviour as the subject of his discourse when you see that it proclaims, in its very part, clearly and unequivocally that slavery which

"international" kid-appeal to Groucho

and Presidents, & others, to the Legislature, that it is
imperative, & of the highest importance, to make
improvements. Some of these, in the facilities of Ohio,
are now in progress, & others, which I called some time ago,
will be in progress by the first of next month. So many
of the improvements made previously, however,
will have to be abandoned, and a whispering on their
private merits, among Anti-slavery men, has
caused me to be very anxious about them, as well as
about the improvements to be made. Is it a question
of the "good within their reach?" But to the point.

The State Journal, in introducing this law to its readers, states as its object, that it provides safeguards only for free men, without the least intent or provision to interfere with the legal rights of the slave owner. He does not say whether he will go to the Slave Code, or to the Bible and the Declaration of Independence for his definition of "freeman," nor does he condescend to enlighten us, as to what the "legal rights of the slave owners" are, or on what they rest, whether upon statute or on purchase, or if the latter, whether they include those purchases made by your Southern brethren" last year, from the "cargo of the Wanderer," and their descendants.

The Journal further saith that "this bill provides in law that there shall be no more slaveholding in Ohio, it is strictly according to the Constitution" (meaning, doubtless, the State Constitution). (2.) That there is to be no more kidnapping in this State "than is required by the Constitution of the United States, and by Federal Legislation." Please to note the progress of our editor in the science of Constitutional interpretation, or rather *interpretation*. We have before us, it argued that the Constitution sanctions slavery, we have now made the profound discovery that kidnapping is unconstitutional, and is required by that instrument.

But the debtors is yet to come. The crimes and trespasses and depredations and depolitizations by this set are: (1) holding slaves in the State of Ohio; (2) seizing or arresting, or detaining by fraud or force, to arrest any person as a fugitive from service; (3) shipping or bringing or attempting to induce, persuade, or carry off a person to slavery or servitude, in reference to the three sections embracing these crimes, 416, specifies as follows:

"No slave in the United States shall be held to service or labor in this state, under the laws of the State of Ohio, or any other law or ordinance, or any law or ordinance of any city or town, or any other authority."

This is a plain and simple law of the State of Ohio, general, simple, that the slaves and their friends who have prospered as slaves, and profited, are compelled

and then, in our own consciousness, that we have
done the best and do the most for the negro people.
While we talk about the wrongs of the negro, and his degradation,
we are travestied in the expression of it. How amazingly
atrocious are the atrocities in those Southern states, and
more abhorrent than what we are every day reading
from the same source. Only think of gold plates
preventing the carriage of slavery, and with proclama-
tions of readiness to admit new states, state of alabam
representations of the aggressions of negroes, and
with pledges not to interfere with its suggestions upon
the rights of four millions of native Americans? When
such practices and such representations are now? When
they are a whit less ridiculous and below, than in
the meetings against Kluxing, except what the kidnappings
of the persons chiefly saving protection from it? So little
as we have one of these, we shall have the other. And
so long as we have editors of religious Journals, who will
build up their subscription lists on the merit of their being
anti-slavery, while they are not saying that slaveholding
is inherently sinful, so long as we have publications who will
rise to a office on the merit of their eloquent declamation
against slavery, and the slave power, and yet won't shun
expressly authorizing some of the worst features of it,
the Free States.

Despair has ruined me, but resumption rules; mitigation
Cheap is the service of virtue, and yet how dearly we pay
for vice!

